

Appln. No. 10/529,049

Attorney Docket No. 10808-227

## II. Remarks

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

After entering this Reply, claims 1-16 remain pending.

### *Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103*

Claims 1-2 and 4-7 and 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0130354 to Sekigawa et al. (Sekigawa) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,821,575 issued to Mistry et al. (Mistry).

Claim 1 recites that the connecting region extends across the first side of the substrate region to the source region, where the first side is narrower than the third and fourth sides adjacent the control regions. Neither, Sekigawa or Mistry teach this element. Specifically, neither one teaches the connection region extending between the substrate region and the source region across the narrower side of the substrate region. Accordingly, the combination of Sekigawa and Mistry do not teach the present invention according to claim 1.

Claims 2, 4-7 and 15-16 depend from claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable for at least the same reasons as given above in support of claim 1.

Claims 3 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekigawa and Mistry as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,683,918 issued to Smith et al. (Smith).

Claims 3 and 8 depend from claim 1. Further, Smith does not teach the elements noted above as missing from Sekigawa and Mistry. Therefore, claims 3

BRINKS  
HOFFER  
GILSON  
ELTON

Appln. No. 10/529,049

**THIS PAGE BLANK (USPTO)**